DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 173 HE 026 853

AUTHOR Silverman, Robert J.
TITLE Comments and Replies: Academic Conversations. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 4 Nov 93
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (18th, Pittsburgh, PA, November 4-7, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Quality; *Epistemology; *Expository Writing; Higher Education; *Interaction Process Analysis; Literature Reviews; Opinions; *Persuasive Discourse; Rhetorical Criticism; Scholarly Journals; *Technical Writing; Writing for Publication
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This paper uses an epistemological framework to address the nature of the interactions among authors and responders in professional journals in the context of how such dialog affects the "states-of-the arts." It articulates the rhetorical strategies in four logics-in-use relating to posited epistemological domains, as well as "validating" the framework in which these domains are explicated. The study surveyed approximately 350 journals in many fields for evidence of comments and critical reactions associated with regular publication and identified 21 such papers. Papers were placed into four contexts of knowing, based on variations of the concepts of regulativeness and constitutiveness of both the knowledge base and of the community. These differences are then labeled as either: (1) methodological correctness and paradigmatic appropriateness, (2) contention and fortification, (3) interpretive appropriateness, or (4) "collective integrity." Study findings suggest that such professional dialog works to maintain and reproduce the logic of the various knowledge contexts, so that while the subject matter written about changes, how the dialog proceeds remains the same over time. An appendix lists the 21 journal articles examined. (Contains 11 references.) (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 365 173

COMMENTS AND REPLIES: ACADEMIC CONVERSATIONS

Robert J. Silverman
Professor of Education
Ohio State University

[I acknowledge with thanks the contributions of Ms. Mary Beth Parisi (Ohio State University) in the collection and interpretation of the data]

HE 026 853

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Pittsburgh Hilton and Towers, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, November 4-7, 1993. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

COMMENTS AND REPLIES: ACADEMIC CONVERSATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The construction of an area of study, the logic used by its members in the work of the area, the methodological approaches, the choices evident in problems studied or projects assumed are, at times, evident in conversations and other interactions among members of an area. These interactions may occur in informal discourse communities, at national meetings where work is being presented, in and around journals relating to specializations, and in text treatments, such as reviews, designed to introduce neophytes to an area.

These media are both formal and informal, and can be public or private. Some conversations, such as those between a gatekeeper or reviewers and an author are usually not revealed outside the privileged relationship, and when they are, it is with the permission of the participants.

While the private interactions are unavailable for study and the public are emphemeral, one "venue" (an old word which is now used for everything) which is accessible and which embodies serious concerns about the construction and development of an area are the comments and replies that appear either systematically or occasionally in research and scholarly journals. While it is less likely that a reader will respond to a journal with a letter if she or he approved completely an author's work, it is assumed that the issues raised and the debate reflected suggest the arguments considered of value to an area as it develops. It is likely that not all comments are published and that an editor uses discretion in making some comments available for reasons that might suggest additional complex rationales.

Some journals publish a few comments and replies with the initial availability of the subject paper, others pre-circulate the paper to a large number of peers and ask for comments that are published with the manuscript. Other journals publish comments when received after the availability of the paper in question. This research does not look at journals that are structured on a comment and reply format, but does focus on research and scholarly journals that publish such work periodically, either at the same time or subsequent to the appearance of the paper in question.

The purpose of such focus is to better understand the issues at the state-of-the-art. Manuscripts that are published represent a fraction of those submitted, and while there are significant differences in acceptance rates by field, we can agree that for a research/scholarly paper to appear it usually has to be considered by peers as worthy for dissemination, addressing the current and future direction of the area. To better understand the arguments is to better appreciate what the issues are and the rhetorical strategies used for pursuing those interests. This paper will articulate those strategies in four logics-in-use relating to posited epistemological domains. This paper also has the subsidiary purpose of "validating" the framework in which these

domains are explicated (Silverman,1993).

FRAMEWORK

This research does not use standard divisions, such as the natural and social sciences, to discriminate the varieties of logic and context among comment and reply materials in different areas of study. It does use a heuristic framwork, developed by Silverman (1993) to differentiate areas of study based on substantive and communal variations. The framework posits that areas of study or contexts differ on the basis of the regulativeness or constitutiveness of the knowledge being developed and the community engaged in such development.

While the logic of the framework cannot be developed here, a brief presentation is in order. The categories developed have an interesting story in the history of ideas, with various scholars suggesting some portion of the differentiations made (e.g. Rouse, 1987) and there is numerous current work that touch on the discriminations made (e.g. Fuchs,1992) , a topic for a future paper. In the present, Lorraine Code (1991) noted the value of using the notions of constitutiveness and regulativeness for both knowledge and community.

A constitutive community is organic, evolving, capturing the attention of individuals who regardless of discipline of origin or field share an interest in certain intellective issues, and have relations of value. Code (1991) notes:

> ...every cognitive act takes place at a point of intersection of innumerable relations, events, circumstances, and histories that make the knower and known what they are, at that time. (It focuses on) the complex network of relations within which an organsim realizes, or fails to realize, its potential, be they historical, material, geographical, social, cultural, racial, institutional, or other (pp.269-270).

The regulative community is reflected in the logic of relations that exist within an existing discipline. Code notes that such communities are authoritarian as opposed to authoritative. "...An authoritarian knower...claim(s) credibility on the basis of privilege alone or of ideological orthodoxy (p.85). There is an overemphasis of self-realizaion and self-reliance. (p.276) In brief, a constitutive community is a kaleidoscope, not a hierarchy or layered phenomenon.

Regarding the applicability of these descriptors in terms of knowlege, Code (1991) notes that constitutive knowledge takes account of testimony and cognitive interdependence (p.111); it is:

> Marked by ... a respect that resists the temptation to know primarily in order to control..., oriented toward letting the objects of study speak for themselves,...non reductive,... a sense of the knowing subject's position in, and accountability to, the world she studies... (and) a concern to understand difference, to accord it respect, hence to overcome temptations to dismiss it as theoreticaly disruptive, aberrant, cognitively recalcitrant (pp.150-151).

Regulative knowledge, simply put, is paradigm-like, whether it be

an empirical castle or theoretical framework.

Regulative and constitutive knowledge and communities intersect to produce four possibilities that reflect the contexts in which academic work takes place.

----Regulative communities develop regulative knowledge as commonly prepared empiricists articulate the state of knowledge in an agreed-upon focused domain. (e.g. sociologists studying deviancy)

----Constitutive communities develop regulative knowledge as a cohort of scholars find value in a specific theoretical perspective (e.g. Foucault)

----Regulative communities develop constitutive knowledge as scholars from specific communities use their fields to develop an understanding of an issue, problem, event, or phenomenon. (e.g. sociologists studying the construction of knowledge in a laboratory)

----Constitutive communities develop constitutive knowledge as cohorts of scholars shape new understandings of relevant concerns and topics. (e.g. scholars interested in gender discovering how men and women scholars become tenured)

This paper addresses the nature of interaction, in journal space, among authors and responders to the articulation of the states-of-the-arts in these domains.

METHODOLOGY

We surveyed approximately 350 journals in all fields, except the natural sciences, located in The Ohio State University Libraries, for evidence of comments and replies associated with regular publication, as opposed to those appearing only in special thematic issues.

Of those browsed, approximately 100 were examined more closely, for the period 1975-1990, upon what appeared some evidence that comments and replies were included in the publication, such as the presence of letters, or discussion. Of this 100, approximately 40 published some kind of comments but fewer than 10 included, as a matter of course, author reactions to critics.

We searched for comments and replies and when discovered went back to the paper to which they were attached. For this study articles appearing in the following journals provided papers, comments and replies: American Journal of Psychotherapy, Educational Theory, Comparative Studies in Society and History, Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, Signs, Social Studies of Science, and Teachers Colllege Record. It might be noted how rare comments and replies are in the research and scholarly literature. We expected that they would be available more frequently than they were. Unless planned as a dialogical journal, it is not common to see much discussion in its pages.

Twenty-one papers and their attached comments and replies were examined, six for each of the first three contexts and three for the fourth. More than 21 papers were read by this researcher and placed within the four contexts. Those included in this study promised to add to the interpretive meaning for each context, When

possible, the journals used maximized the different titles available; but, as noted, interpretive promise and variety were most important. (See Appendix for articles used)

A Rhetorical Approach

We have taken a rhetorical approach to the examination of the texts, namely the comments and replies associated with articles located in the journals noted above. The papers were read and the arguments identified in the paper, the comment(s) and the reply. This author developed an understanding of each bundle of work as they interacted, what could be called their intertextuality-"the web of texts against which each new text is placed or places itself..."(Bazerman,1993,p.20). Each bundle was examined in isolation and in conjunction with others in its context and through comparative analysis the logics-in-use became evident.

While the logic of this research suggests Charney's (1993,p.204) observation that:

> ...the aim of scientific discourse is profoundly argumentative and not merely expository; (that) the goal is to persuade readers, to convince them of the validity and importance of the work, and to motivate them to acknowledge the force of the contribution by explicitly accepting and building upon it,

we fear that this consideration of a rhetorical approach is stylized in the terms of a regulative model, or at least the actions within contexts informed by a regulative dimension. Besides considering academic contexts as discourse communities engaging in persuasion and negotiation, one can envision, as does Berkenkotter,et.al (1991), writing to join a conversation (p.206). While certainly aware of "divergent rationalities" (Shweder,1986), we much prefer Lyne's (1990) definition of "rhetoric" in relation to this project:

> a discourse strategy spanning and organizing numerous discourses, and acting as a trajectory for discourses yet unorganized. (pp.37-38).

Such a conception sees "subject matter not just as a state of affairs but as a direction of affairs..., rhetoric as working logic..., (and the possibility that) rhetoric may embed strategies, such as the strategy of association and dissociation, into a subject matter"(pp.47-49).

FINDINGS

Rhetorical treatments of texts usually focus on a specific, rather focused document or book or some part of one. This will not be so here. In the interest of a broader brush-stroke, we will present some larger dimensions of the comment/response logic-in-use. This, obviously, is at the expense of a more finely-tuned treatment.

The Regulative Knowledge/Regulative Community Context: Methodological Correctness and Paradigmatic Appropriateness

An examination of materials suggest that critics react to and authors respond to methodolocial and substantive issues or paradigmatic patterns. The data studied appear to be in one or the other camp.

On one extreme are reactions that question whether the statistics presented constitute "sufficient proof", whether the evidence for a claim is direct enough, noting that the research "has no relevance ...because the research design eviscerates the phenomenon which they purport to study." Of interest, it would appear that the emotive or affective dimension is related to the nature of the specific publication in which the exchange appears, namely it's audience. So, we have in a feminist journal a scholar noting that "as a reproductive endocrinologist with experience in the feminist movement, I feel an absolute obligation to respond..." and in one focusing on psychotherapy the critic claiming if the author's data were correct it would "bespeak" respondants' "unmatched cynicism and immorality", given their traitorous perspectives in relation to the critic's and respondants' common interests.

But, here, on the methodological extreme, we have, in short, a kind of substantive jujitsu, which is reflected in the following paragraphs of a comment and reply for a paper in physics.

(comment)
"Any partial analysis that does not take into account the development and whole content of Langevin's contribution will result in distorted interpretations.... A thorough and integrated interpretation of Langevin's thought can only be achieved by close inspection of his later papers.... Taking the integrated approach I have referred to, I believe that the identity between Langevin and Blokhintsev claimed by Cross is not legitimate. Alternately, I believe that Langevin is closer to Bohr- although not close enough to support a claim of identity."

(response)
"In the context of the paper, my perspective on Langevin's position is rather less important than the reading of it by physicists of the 1950's. I should point out, however, that I made no claim of 'identity' between his views and those of Blokhintsov, as the paragraph quoted by (the critic) actually makes clear. Whether Langevin's position was closer to that of Bohr is debatable. He certainly had no sympathy with the more fanciful conceptions of complementarity Bohr articulated in the 1930's. Here, however, I must defer to (critic's) greater familiarity with Langevin's work, pausing only to deny that my 'partial' treatment of it is symptomatic of an 'epistemological blockage' in the form of an 'intense expression' or otherwise. Analysis of it in greater depth was merely unnecessary."

This exchange is evident of jockeying by scholars from the same camp attempting to get it right.. The response is wonderful

in its complexity, from noting the critic as misreading the original paper, the original author having less expertise than the critic but correcting the critic, the author indicating his interpretation is not at issue even though he defends his interpretation.

On this extreme, challenge can be solved by "more extensive studies" and for more precise research. "...More work needs to be done to determine precisely what mechanisms have led to the present sex imbalance...." Critics claim authors are unfamiliar with sources, authors respond that the cited ask differerent questions than they do. And when a criticiam is solid, then the author may claim the work "has pioneering value" and "methodological difficulties." This before the call for "stepwise empirical exploration....Such cumulative findings can only help therapies guard against over-generalized conclusions...."

The alternative to methodological sparring, with consequent scraping and bloodied noses, is focus on the paradigm. My data evidence only one good example of this pattern. In the case in point a newer scholar is attempting to develop a new framework for the study of ecological memory, and he has a difficult task: he must acknowledge the importance of a still-producing senior member of his context while attempting to displace him. Thus, one reads the following in the original article regarding the current center, each statement reflecting the complexity of the attempted revolution:

1. The ecological approach to memory is not new (Neisser,in press) but its current growth can be attributed to Neisser...
2. In Questions, Neisser is extremely critical....Although I am not so negative..., I agree....
3. Neisser harbors a similar view...the trouble is that the paradigm contains nothing new that will direct us to important memory questions.
4. Despite Neisser's failure to provide a guiding framework, two things he says represent features of the ecological attitude I will develop.
5....the contributions have been substantial, far more so, I think, than Neisser would have us believe.
6. Neisser has stressed the why of memory... but this emphasis has not yet been transformed into a concerted or coherent research effort.
7. There have been previous efforts to foster an evolutionary psychology of memory most notably by (William) James some 90 or so years ago and more recently by Neisser. A serious problem with these efforts....

Here we acknowledge the importance of the leader, indicate his gaps, acknowledge our suggested direction can be located in his work, suggest the guru is both somewhat less revealing, meaning a bit substantively political, note that he is not relevant to the research future, and place him with the great William James which at once confirms his value and his burial.

There are two reactions to the paper that outlines a new research paradigm. The first is critical of the author's insufficient mapping of the new direction("It does not set out in

an explicit or objective fashion the important questions and the necessary methodologies.") And this critic acknowledges that even Neisser has difficulties with the current research program. The second critique is from Neisser himself.

Neisser begins magisterially: "An ecological approach is beginning to take shape in many parts of cognitive psychology." And he refers to his piece not as a critique but a commentary on the state of the field. He first defends his paradimgatic choices over time, noting it "did not reflect any lack of interest in theory. Instead it was a conscious response to what I saw as the existing situation in the study of memory." Neisser develops three points and refers to the original author's agenda in the second one, as if to say, "You really are not so important that I will immediately address you." He calls the author's interests ambitious, with which he is in full sympathy, and while he has some questions, he believes it has important possibilities. Neisser then in his third point outlines a richer, more creative research program than the author does, one that has "a refreshing uncertainty". This is to remind the author and the field, in our judgment, that he is not an historical figure. Last, Neisser takes on a magisterial tone and combines it with uncertainty, not allowing the door to close with the author's agenda inside ("There is a lot to know out there, and we have only begun to explore it. Theoretical issues will surely be important in the future development of the field but it is hard to be sure just what those issues will be.")

The original author locates his ideas once again in Neisser and indicates that the leader's ambitious research possibilities are <u>too</u> ambitious. ("It will take a great wrench of mind made all the more difficult by unfamiliar terminology.") Not to be outdone, with the last magisterial words he says "But that is what the ecological study of memory is all about....That in general form may be the nature of any ecological theory of memory."

These then are two streams of meaning in the fully regulative context, either to get it right or to examine the context. These are quite different from the logic-in-use in the regulative knowledge/constitutive community context.

<u>The Regulative Knowledge/Constitutive Community Context: Contention and Fortification</u>

If authors and critics are concerned with contexts in which they narrowly define themselves with certain work, in this frame we are concerned with a broader community of interest reflecting a concern for a theory or model or framework or the work of a theorist whose contributions are considered generalizable.

The papers uncovered were not celebratory of a work as much as they were critical or were trying to place it in perspective. The papers dealt with the concept of "paradigm" from Kuhn, the work of Kohlberg, Michael Apple, Bourdieu, among others. Thus,the comments were in reaction to authors' treatments of work or persons who are considered foundational- not something to be taken lightly. And,the emotive grounding, predictably is severe. Either the author

or reviewer is obsessed, obscures, pretentious, solipsistic, Kafkaesque, distorts arguments, misses the point, misconstrues the analysis, does not seem to realize, goes too far, misses the main point and wholly misunderstands the theory, fails to distinguish, etc. The judgments are hard and do not equivocate. It appears that the authors and critics are very contentious with their contentions as they fortify positions. How do they do so?

One strategy of fortifcation is to speak in the voice of the scholar whose work is subject to attack. It is one thing for the author to respond to the critic, it is another for Kohlberg or person of similar stature to do so. In response to a reactor's claim that the author misses Kohlberg's main point, the author quotes six lines from a Kohlberg text, and puts word into the germinal theorist's mouth: "However, Kohlberg would contend..." But it is even more interesting as the author follows this with, "Thus, I have claimed elsewhere that educators need to.... This is consistent with Kohlberg's position." The claim made elsewhere is in the original paper being critiqued, while it would appear on the surface as being a claim in a different source. Fortification also occurs by making the text active as Kohlberg realizes, Kohlberg admits, Kohlberg assumes, Kohlberg claims, Kohlberg is critical.... While this author attempts to balance support with criticism, the comment claims that the author wholly misunderstands the theory and is confused. Following such a claim, which occurs in a number of separate comments, the reactor then uses the occasion to enlarge the claim by noting that the author is not the only person who fails in the same way: "the error is common." Thus the critique of a specific paper provides the opportunity of making a more generic statement.

This positioning of the critic is of interest. While it is in relation to the author of a paper, there are added complexities as the critic may position him or herself as a third party. In this case it is between the author and Marx and the author and a complex contemporary and historical cohort:

"Marx, of course, would agree with this....The idea of a context-free science is anathema to Marx, as it is to many others. However, the extreme relativism that we find in the author does not exist in Marx. Marx argues, falsely perhaps..."

"I know of no neurophysiologist who would construe the transformation of sensory inputs into electrical discharges that becomes speech resulting from neuron discharges as a metaphor. The author accepts this description as such and he unknowingly presupposes thereby a philosophy of nature model for which Engels is usually castigated"

Here the critic positions himself, his own knowledge context, his expertise, an awareness of the larger and more expansive implications of the paper and positions the author with a figure (Engels) such that the author is found less worthy through this association. The quotes above are followed with the critic claiming that the author's analyses are either trivial or need more thought to clear up their limitations. The author is either simple-minded

or not a very good scholar. At the same time, in a spirit of generosity, it is not uncommon for a critic to end a comment with a bit of possibility for the author. " Here the author correctly argued... and lays out work for future development."

Not to outdone, the author in this case, and in many others, suggests the other's complete confusion by noting that he or she makes the exact point he or she is arguing against. In this case, in addition, "His own language framework suggests that he is suffering the current intellectual malady of a paradigm shift." Both authors and critics are branded for not having read other works that they have written that touch on the arguments of specific concern in the interchange and claim that their failure to deal with issues more fully is a function of space limitations, and they demonstrate their knowledge by citing something they or others have written that suggests a fuller appreciation is well reflected in their understanding. Authors' reviews of literature and books in press answer the criticsms of their limited conceptions and command of the field.

Last, we will present what appear to be paradoxical contentions that privilege the writer, whether author or critic. Certainly a comment or reply may contain both laudatory and critical notions about a paper or a comment. But, it is not uncommon for the focus of attention, in a narrow sense, to be <u>both</u> positive and negative. Examples follow:

1. The critic claims the author "lucidly explains" a theory but "regretfully conclude(s) he misses the main point of the theory." This allows the critic to "contend...," to comment on how the writer misses the point, and to present his special insight.

2. The critic writes that the author's appropriation of Bourdieu's concept of the habitus...is surely innovative..." A page later he notes that Bourdieu's work was popular in the 1980's (this paper was written in 1991) and then blames the author six pages later for an "unadulterated use of Bourdieu." Earlier the critic claimed that "a critique of (the author) must begin with Bourdieu because (he) uncritically takes Bourdieu on board.... This is not to say, though, that Bourdieu's theories are irretrievable. They are extremely powerful but require the proper circumspection and modification." One might guess who can provide it and place himself as a new spokesperson for this French giant. In response, the author claims the critic "renders my analysis vulnerable to attack" through distortion.

3. The critic notes that the author is correct "that Bloom is short on argument, but he forces us to raise the hard questions which the author skirts." So, the author is negligent for not reacting to questions never raised. The author, in his rebuttal, suggests the critic should rather Bloom answer the questions first. This is a game of richochet.

4. The critic claims that the author senses a critical danger but does not address it and then notes in response to the author's claim that some feminist work has not been self-

critical...philosophically, that "it is a genuine advance to be able to recognize the limits or boundaries of one's thinking." Clearly the author's strength, in the critic's view, is her awareness of the limitations of what she stands by.

5. The critic notes that the author "does not say anything about the natural sciences, but since he quotes Nietzsche's description of neurophysiological processes as being a metaphorical process we might conclude that physics, chemistry, and biology too are metaphorical. This (the author) does not condemn." Thus, the author does not say something but since he alluded to it in the critic's view, the author said what he did not say and doesn't criticize it.

6. The author responds in closing: "I want to thank (the critic) for taking up the isssue of relativism. I think he took the discussion in a direction that obscured both my own position and the educational policy issues that deserve most serious attention. His analysis clearly demonstrates the need to deal with questions of metaphor, relativism, and social reform in terms of a multicultural world." The end of argument is just more argument. Obscurity opens possibilities for more obscurity, ad infinatum.

7. This last reaction is mild and "tongue-in-cheek". An author develops a complex analysis of female sexuality in paradigmatic perspective, actively using Kuhn to frame her analysis. The critic comments on a minor illustrative fact in the mind-wrenching article. The author responds with thanks "for her illuminating analysis of Shakespeare's will; and (offers) apologies for what I suppose I had better admit was a kind of purposive slovenliness." This goes on for a bit. Of course, if paradigms are related to facts and facts are incorrect.... The author deals with the issue through ridicule.

These, then, are the logics-in-use as authors contend and fortify their positions. Many are creative as they combine challenge with strategies for advantage. Argument is advantaging in this context as the significance of a model, framework, theorist, or concept is associated with devotees who appear to attach much personal/professional meaning to the outcomes of debate. As argument goes, so they go. Given the various initial starting points that authors and critics represent in a constitutive community, with major differences in intellective and professional experiences, the logics noted here are probably not surprising. The arguments are much broader than in the previous context, and while one might be attracted to the principals' intelligence, one is hardly taken by their charm.

<u>The Constitutive Knowledge/Regulative Community Context: Interpretive Appropriateness</u>

An author writes:
This is an article about questions.... Our theories are...only

> as good as our data. What is needed, I will suggest, is not so much data as questions. What we know is constrained by interpretive frameworks which, of course, limit our thinking; what we <u>can</u> know will be determined by the kinds of questions we learn to ask.

In this context, authors and critics explore the consequences for understanding a topic in a new way as reflected in persons' affiliations within various communities. While there are claims made by critics for author success and failure they typically respond less to how well something was accomplished than to the value of what was done. For example, an author may be charged with not asking a relevant or dealing with the larger question. With this assumption, it is most common for critics to pursue what they consider to be more appropriate questions through a variety of strategies.

The topics addressed range from a study of a tenants' movement; analyses of witches, science policy, and co-citation practices. The critics raise questions regarding various ways of considering the adequacy of the knowledge consequences in relation to their interests. Following are some reflections of the arguments used in addressing them.

A critic claims that the author's "functional approach seems incapable of grasping...(the topic) and she believes that even though the author's arguments cast in an anthropological frame "seem plausible,...it does not explain exhaustively...." Her concerns over the limited development is only made clear by the second critic of the paper who refers to the first critic's authoring of an anthology "of essential writings" relating to the topic.

Another critic argues that an author's treatment will mislead the reader. This example reflects alternative perspectives within a community of interest. If one were to use a dominant, if patriarchical definition, of leadership one would understand women's absence from opportunities. However, an alternate, feminist definition would reflect how women do, in fact, provide leadership in ways different from men. So. The consequences of analysis are presumably important for women, regardless, but the differences are significant. The critic's definition is associated with a new concept of her fashioning and represents a larger conceptual issue having professional as well as ideological value for her. It is of interest that the author perceives the reaction as "an unjustified attack and imputation of motive" and he challenges her by critiquing a reference she uses with which he believes she has allegiences.

There are interests in providing open space; in fact, an author speaks of "stepping back" and examining the paper in light of the critique, and in leaving open space for new questions, even though reflection might confirm the value of the initial approach. But, it is most common for critics to use the author's treatment as an opportunity to analyze the topic within an alternate perspective that reflects another community of interest.

In one instance an ethnography of a science policy executed through a rhetorical study of "dossiers" or files is challenged for "fail(ing to) adequately conceptual;ize the political character of

the object of study." The comment is actually a political analysis of the case study provided by the author, to which the author replies that the critic "displays paradigmatic blindness to what we were up to .... Having so redefined our endeavor (he) can safely point to what he perceives as our basic failure...."

An author's summary of her approach to a critic represents the dimensions of this context:

> I first discuss our areas of agreement, then refute his critique in detail and finally comment upon a few interesting points....In responding to the critique I will hold to the terminology used in the original paper which differs somewhat from that used in (the critic's) response.

There appears to be genuine joy in the conversation over possibilities, if not over the "revealing criticisms" that suggest the act of displacement and repositioning that is being attempted. One approach authors use to react to this repositioning is to make it evident that they are aware of the alternative suggested by the critic and are aware of its flaws. Thus, they challenge the expertise and appropriateness of the alternative analytic mechanisms. For example, a scholar notes the various definitions of malaria and a la Fleck (1979) notes the implications for choosing one. The critic claims the chosen one is dated and that there are new "hot" topics that could have been selected for analysis. In responding the author "stands back" and perceives "revealing criticisms", coming back to the construction of the original paper, and following with an ending footnote in which he tweaks the critic's nose, noting the critic's presumed relation to a radical philosopher even though he works for a staid Federal agency. One is reminded of a game of hopscotch, with the onlookers challenging the hopper's footing.

The Constitutive Knowledge/Constitutive Community Context: "Collective Integrity"

The sub-title of this context, for this paper, is taken from Mary Ann Caws (1989) who presents the notion of "collective integrity" as reflecting a "circulation of ideas"...in which:

> ...the very speaking core of our interpretive community takes its truest pleasure and deepest joy in the exchange of our ideas taken up and understood together, in our essential difference and in our common comprehension (p.134)....

There are fewer fully constitutive papers in the literature than papers in other contexts and among those available we located but three examples of critical reaction, one series of which was invited by the editors of the journal publishing the original paper.

An author reflects this constitutiveness through a paper analyzing a feminist conference in Copenhagen, using a music metaphor to envision her theme of "variation while the same time eliciting orchestral support." The multiple reactions combine in various patterns, on the one hand, critics' agreement, sympathy, support, and reminders of personal experiences, and on the other alternative interpretations, disagreement, rephrasing, bothered

concerns, and items that were perturbing. The comment that follows weaves these dimensions:

> Generally, I agree with (the author's) perceptions of...,especially with her description of the main issues.... But I do not share her pessimism concerning the future of such conferences nor her despair over the.... I do share her anger at the way in which such conferences and debates are ridiculed by the mass media and by men. But I would add a few points.

A critic for another paper uses the notion of "illumination" to cast how her peers perceive different analyses; different voices illuminate "different facets of extraordinarily complex social phenomena." (She compares this with others who speak with one voice, "They quote only each other and with reverence.") For the Copenhagen paper, the author notes that her respondants "overlooked" her main point and concludes that "we just evaluated the cost-benefit ratio of Copenhagen differently." In fact, in one paper, the critic argued that her own work would be different today than it was three years ago and would have allowed for a different reaction to the dialogue appearing in the journal.

Illumination can be challenged. In a specific instance, an author wanting to "recapture the atmosphere", presenting "emotional clues to certain themes" was challenged by a critic with an objective eye who was the "official" biographer of the individual treated illuminatively. His dismay for the failure of author reliability was greeted with the author's acknowledgement of his expertise and different goal; she was attempting to do the opposite of what the critic had done. How about this for confirmation of the framework undergirding this analysis!

COMMENTARY

The meaning of this work has been alluded to in the presentation of the framework and in the comments associated with the findings. It would appear that in each knowledge context work is critiqued according to different logics, that there is not only a language of production that varies in each context but a way of considering and writing about appropriate ways to articulate and develop the ground of the work. While it is a relatively easy challenge to add additional substantive and technical information to one's base and thus extend one's understanding, this paper reveals that more is at issue than merely challenging oneself with more. Understanding grows not only hierarchically but laterally and along the lateral dimension one perceives knowledge contexts that appear to have different theories-in-use. At times this researcher came across critical reactions that were developed in a logic different from that being presented in the paper at issue. They were refuted by the author as irrelevant. They were not, and I believe, could not be considered. They were about different worlds.

It might be argued that in our rush for connections among ways of knowing that we appreciate that the grounds of our differences are deeper than the knowledge we parade superficially and that change is not merely knowing about different traditions, even if

they are acknowledged as valid. Learning different logics might be no different than appreciating a different culture; and learning to talk fluently in its idiom may be equated with the challenge of doing so in a cross-cultural perspective. Many of us attending professional meetings may have come to this conclusion after hearing exquisite work in traditions alternative to the one of our comfort zone and not being able to reproduce it well, even in one's memory of its initial delivery.

There are other, interesting observations that could be made. For example, critics often used unpublished papers in their comments. Uncertified knowledge is used as if it were. Also, both authors and critics relate the work and each other to additional scholars, both contemporary and historic. What we find,then, is frequently the embedding of current work and actors in various dimensions of their fields despite their interests for such associations. We are known by the company others say we relate to. In addition, the reader is often asked to play a part in the controversy by being asked explicitly to decide who is correct. Of course, the logics discussed in this paper are presumably used because the actors believe that readers can be persuaded by them.

CONCLUSION

In this paper we have argued that four contexts of knowing, based on variations of the regulativeness and constitutiveness of both the knowledge base and of the community demonstrate different logics for the articulation of knowledge in their domains. The differences were labelled: 1) methodological correctness and paradigmatic appropriateness, 2) contention and fortification, 3) interpretive appropriateness, and 4) "collective integrity." These approaches to the proper actions maintain and reproduce the logic of the various knowledge contexts, so that while what they talk and write about changes, how they do so remains the same over time. Such certainty in the midst of such complexity may be the best we can hope for.

REFERENCES

Bazerman, Charles. "Intertextual Self-Fashioning: Gould and Lewontin's Representations of the Literature." In Jack Selzer,ed. Understanding Scientific Prose. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993, pp.20-41.

Berkenkotter, Carol et.al. "Social Context and Socially Constructed Texts: The Initiation of a Graduate Student into a Writing Research Community." In Charles Bazerman and James Paradis, eds. Textual Dynamics of the Professions: Historical and Contemporary Studies of Writing in Professional Communities. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991, pp.191-215.

Caws, Mary Ann. The Art of Interference: Stressed Readings in Verbal and Visual Texts. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Charney, Davida. "A Study in Rhetorical Reading: How Evolutionists Read 'The Sprandrels of San Marco'. In Jack Selzer, ed. Understanding Scientific Prose. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993, pp. 203-231.

Code, Lorraine. What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Fleck, Ludwik. Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979. (orig. pub. 1935)

Fuchs, Stephan. The Professional Quest for Truth: A Social Theory of Science and Knowledge. Albany: SUNY Press, 1992.

Lyne, John. "Bio-Rhetorics: Moralizing the Life Sciences." In Herbert W. Simons, ed. The Rhetorical Turn: Invention and Persuasion in the Conduct of Inquiry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990, pp.35-57.

Rouse, Joseph. Knowledge and Power: Toward a Political Philosophy of Science. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

Shweder, Richard. "Divergent Rationalities." In Donald Fiske and Richard Shweder, eds. Metatheory in Social Science: Pluralisms and Subjectivities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986, pp.163-196.

Silverman, Robert. "Contexts of Knowing: Their Shape and Substance." Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization. 14#4, June 1993, pp.372-385.

APPENDIX

Context One

"The Crisis in Physics: Dialectical Materialism and Quantum Theory" by Andrew Cross in Social Studies of Science, 21/4

"Discrimination Against Women Academics in Australian Universities" by Jennifer M. Jones and Frances H. Lovejoy in Signs, 5/3

"Contraceptives for Males" by William J. Bremner and David M. de Kretser in Signs, 1/2

"Patients' Reactions to Humorous Interventions in Psychotherapy" by Eliyahu Rosenheim and Gabriel Golan in American Journal of Psychotherapy, 60/1

"The Therapist's Therapist" by John C. Norcross, Diane J. Strausser, and Frank J. Faltus in American Journal of Psychotherapy, 62/1

"The How and Why of Ecological Memory" by Darryl Bruce in Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 114/1

Context Two

"Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory" by Jane Flax in Signs, 12/4

"Who Is Sylvia? On the Loss of Sexual Paradigms" by Elizabeth Janeway in Signs, 5/4

"Foundationalism and Recent Critiques of Education" by Walter Feinberg in Educational Theory, 39/2

"Ethnicity and Practice" by G. Carter Bentley in Comparative Studies in Society and History, 29/1

"Lawrence Kohlberg and Development: Some Reflections" by Robert Craig in Educational Theory, 24/2

"Curriculum as Cultural Reproduction: An Examination of Metaphor as a Carrier of Ideology" by C.A. Bowers in Teachers College Record, 82/2

Context Three

"The Use and Abuse of Anthropology: Reflections on Feminism and Cross-cultural Understanding" by M.Z. Rosaldo in Signs, 5/3

"Women and Witches: Patterns of Analysis" by Clarke Garrett in Signs, 3/2

"Sex Roles in Social Movements: A Case Study of the Tenant Movement in New York City" by Ronald Lawson and Stephen E. Barton in Signs, 6/2

"Limitations of Co-Citation Analysis as a Tool for Science Policy" by Diana Hicks in Social Studies of Science, 17/2

"Representing Biotechnology: An Ethnography of Quebec Science Policy" by Alberto Cambrosio, Camille Limoges and Denyse Pronovost in Social Studies of Science, 20/2

"The Push for a Malaria Vaccine" by David Turnbull in Social Studies of Science, 19/2

Context Four

"The Salon of Natalie Clifford Barney: An Interview with Berthe Cleyrergue" by Gloria Feman Orenstein in Signs,4/3

"In the Beginning Was the Word: The Genesis of Biological Theory" by Donna J. Haraway in Signs, 6/3

"A Feminist View of Copenhagen" by Irene Tinker in Signs,6/3

(The critiques and responses follow in the same or closely following issues of the same journals)